DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 471 586 SO 034 368

AUTHOR	Steffy, D. Michael
TITLE	Culture, Freedom, and Pedagogy in the Public School Classroom: Learning To Teach from an Anthropological Point of View or Pedagogical Anthropology and the Reform of Public Education. A Teaching Essay (with Associated Supplement).
PUB DATE	2002-06-23
NOTE	60p.; Paper presented at the Social Science Education Consortium Annual Conference (Santa Fe, NM, June 23, 2002).
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Acculturation; *Cultural Context; *Educational Change; *Ethnocentrism; *Public Schools; Student Needs; Teacher Education; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

Educators must realize that today's public schools are a specialized development out of the universal culture-process. Research anthropologists have identified cross-culturally as enculturation, the process of acquiring a culture. By virtue of being born into a specific socio-cultural group, all humans have culture, and all human groups enculturate their young. Public education as required by law in this society is but an extension of and addition to the enculturative experience already begun and firmly established in the child's family of orientation and immediate socio-cultural community when that child is given over to the public school system to be educated. It is this very nature as cultural beings and products of enculturation that underlies much of the highly publicized and openly debated failure in the public schools today. Noting that culture has supplanted biology as the primary adaptive mechanism in humans, this paper states that humans function as if their specific culture represented the only way of truly being human. The paper finds that this leads to ethnocentrism, and it discusses ethnocentrism. It asks what intellectual tools most people have for understanding themselves and others, except for the tools acquired from within culture-specific adaptations through the enculturative experience. The paper emphasizes that public school teachers must be prepared to approach their teaching from the modern, holistic, cross-cultural perspective of scientific anthropology or from what has been called an anthropological point of view, so that they can consciously work against the ethnocentric teaching that impedes directed learning across cultural borders. Lists recommended readings. Attached is a supplement: "A Fundamental Proposition of Pedagogical Anthropology along with Some Preliminary First Principles of Cross-Cultural Teaching." (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 471 586

Culture, Freedom, and Pedagogy in the Public School Classroom: Learning to Teach from an Anthropological Point of View or Pedagogical Anthropology and the Reform of Public Education. (A Teaching Essay with Associated Supplement).

D. Michael Steffy

SO 034 368

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. M. STEFFY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Culture, Freedom and Pedagogy in the Public School Classroom:

Learning to Teach from an Anthropological Point of View
or
Pedagogical Anthropology and the Reform of Public Education

A Teaching Essay
(with Associated Supplement)
By D. Michael Steffy, D.Ed.
Instructional Development, Pedagogy and Media Officer and
Adjunct Assistant Professor of Anthropology and Education
Anthropology Department, Queens College of the City University of New York

Presented by invitation at the Social Science Education Consortium 2002 Annual Conference
Santa Fe, New Mexico
June 23, 2002

Educating is a cultural process. Modern public education is a cultural institution that has developed for conducting that process, just as state government or organized religion are cultural institutions evolved to perform their specific socio-cultural functions. Educators must realize, however, that public schools, as we know them today, are a specialized development out of the universal culture-process research anthropologists have identified cross-culturally as enculturation—the process of acquiring a culture. The enculturative experience lies at the very heart of the primary adaptation—culture—that has made humans a successful and dominant life form on the planet earth today. By virtue of being born into a specific socio-cultural group, all humans have culture, and all human groups enculturate their young.

Formal education through schooling, however, is by no means a human universal. The human family and its immediate socio-cultural environs have always been, and continue to be, the primary source of enculturation for children everywhere. Public education as required by law in this society, then, is but an extension of and addition to the enculturative experience already begun and firmly established in the child's family of orientation and immediate socio-

cultural community when that child is given over to the public school system to be educated. And it is our very nature as cultural beings and products of enculturation that underlies much of the highly publicized and openly debated failure in our public schools today.

Ongoing anthropological research indicates that sometime before five or six million years ago, the apes that became our ancestors branched off of the primate line that eventually became our living ape relatives, as we know them today. This, at the time rather insignificant, evolutionary event began what developed into the extremely complex, interdependent and uniquely human process of bio-cultural evolution, resulting eventually in human beings as we know them today. A major product of this ongoing evolutionary process is our almost complete dependence as a species on complex and dynamic learning in a socio-cultural environment for our continuing success as the sentient, culture-bearing and culture-dependent creatures that we have become. Humans evolved biologically to have culture, while they developed culture as their primary adaptive mechanism. Culture, then—generally defined by anthropologists as socially learned and shared symbols integrated into patterns of thinking, believing, acting and their material results—permits each human group to pass on to the next generation of its children, along with its biological heritage, the culture-specific knowledge, including acquired identity, essential beliefs, shared values, basic skills and practical know-how, that have become that group's unique and successful bio-cultural adaptation.

Continued learning through everyday experience by adult group members, however, permits previously enculturated knowledge and behavior to be, not only utilized for, but also altered through, problem-solving by individuals in their personal quest for survival and success. It is, then, this dynamic process of willful application, but also modification when necessary, of acquired culture through practical experience, and not just culture alone, that actually represents

the essential adaptation of our species as cultural animals. And it is the evolved human capacity for this kind of dynamic learning, involving initial culture acquisition and then practical problem-solving with, but also sometimes in spite of, previously acquired culture, that makes human adaptation and evolution through culture possible.

This is how culture has supplanted biology as the primary adaptive mechanism in humans, but our species continues to evolve both biologically and culturally through the action and interaction of both these forms of adaptation. Sorting all this out and attempting to understand and explain it, is the primary task of modern scientific anthropology. Educators must realize, however, that no specific culture, not even their own, can be seen or characterized as the true, right, correct or proper, and certainly not ultimate, human adaptation. There simply is no such thing until all human groups everywhere agree that there is.

Yet, every human group values highly its culturally acquired identity, knowledge and perception of the world, its specific understanding and interpretation of reality—its own cultural adaptation—as if it were both proper and correct. In most cases humans function as if their specific culture were synonymous with all that is Right and Absolutely True and, in some cases, as if it represented the only way of truly being human. That is to say, humans everywhere operate as if their culture were in touch with and accurately represented the only reality. And that is why the following statement seems quite natural for any normal human being: "Other peoples' gods are superstitions, but mine is the one true God." Clearly in this statement, a distinction is being made between what are seen as superstitious beliefs and a known reality.

Anthropologists have identified this universally found tendency to interpret and understand reality based upon enculturated, culture-specific knowledge, without individuals actually realizing what they are doing, by the term—ethnocentrism. Humans are ethnocentric,

because they have been enculturated, and ethnocentrism is as natural a part of being human as is culture itself. What intellectual tools do most of us really have for understanding both ourselves and others, as well as the total reality we all share, except for the tools we all have acquired from within our own culture-specific adaptations through the enculturative experience? Without enculturation in a specific culture, nothing in the world can appear obvious or self-evident; with it almost everything does. And this is the critical point; it appears that way both to "the different others" and to us. We all believe that we "know the Truth" and that we have "gotten it right."

Some years ago, when an elder Old Order Amish woman responded to the question asked by my cultural anthropology mentor doing fieldwork in Pennsylvania, "Why do you insist on reading the Bible in German?" her answer was clearly ethnocentric. "We believe the Bible should be read in the language of Christ, German." These Amish—simple, undereducated (by today's standards), "primitive" farmers—use more languages than many of us. They learn to read "high" German so they can read "their Bible." They speak a dialect of German called Pennsylvania-Dutch, which is a very respectable language, but is not written. And they learn to speak, read and write English to some degree in their own schools, so they can interact with the non-Amish they live among (us) and collectively refer to as "English." Obviously, Jesus did not speak German (but as a god, it could be argued that all languages, past, present and future were available to him). Most of us mortals, however, tend to find this Amish woman's ethnocentrically ignorant response almost quaint, as we smile inwardly and knowingly to ourselves. But what do **we** actually know for sure?

Personally, I grew up attending Sunday "school" in a room on the wall of which was a picture of a pasty-skinned, blond-haired, blue-eyed Christ. I never thought twice about this until years later in graduate school, when I really began to understand the anthropological concept of

culture and the cross-cultural, outside-of-my-own-culture, critical perspective it can offer. Clearly that picture from my impressionable youth was ethnocentric; some might even say "racist." It was also part of my enculturation, as was the Mercator projection map that hung on the wall of my public school classroom. As I remember it, that map had the United States front-and-center with the major landmass of Eurasia split down the middle. It also distorted the relative size of the actually much smaller, "lighter-skinned," "industrialized," "developed" countries to the "North," compared to the actually much larger, "darker-skinned," "underdeveloped," "raw-material" and now "cheap-labor" providing nations to the "South." This presentation seemingly justified the ongoing political and economic domination of the "North" over the "South" led by the United States in a kind of "natural World Order." It did this by locating the equator two-thirds of the way down the map, rather than in the middle as it is on the globe. Why is it so hard to find a Peters Projection map in the classroom, when you need a less subjective, less ethnocentric, "multicultural" view of the world? An Australian colleague with whom I once shared an office took great delight in his Mercator projection map with the world turned upside-down and Australia in the Southern Hemisphere shown front-and-center (and upside-down) roughly where the United States is located on a normal map. (What is "right-side up" or "normal" anyway?)

Human groups see the world through the interpretive lenses of their own specific cultures, and thus, the world in each case becomes their world. Human cultures turn reality itself into multiple, and in the modern world overlapping, realities, each known and understood as the real reality from the inside of each specific cultural adaptation. Many "Blacks" consider most "Whites" to be racists, because they "know" that they have been "victims" of "White" prejudice. Yet many "Whites" consider "Blacks" to be racists as well, because "Whites" "know" that they

have been "victims" of "Black" prejudice through "false" charges of racism. Remember the O.J. Simpson cross-cultural fiasco. The culture-specific interpretation and evaluation of behavior in a cross-cultural situation can generate charges of racism when it is actually unconscious ethnocentrism that is creating "racist like" behavior. Unconscious ethnocentrism is frequently interpreted as conscious racism in this society and increasingly around the world.

It is the supreme irony of human culture, as anthropologists have come to understand it cross-culturally, that many individuals everywhere, functioning from within their own specific cultures, as all humans must, fail to see the subjective, culture-specific nature of their own enculturated view and interpretation of reality. These humans are frequently willing to understand the culture-specific values, knowledge and behavior of another group as representing that group's culture, because the culture of "those others" contrasts to some degree with their own values, knowledge and behavior. Even then, however, ethnocentric humans tend not to understand the "obviously" subjective culture and ethnocentrism of the others as a functional equivalent of their own specific cultural adaptation. What they tend to see is another group of humans with a generally inadequate, improper, or inferior culture compared to their own which is so obviously better and, as a result, understood as superior.

This cross-cultural ignorance exists, because many of us unconsciously and ethnocentrically see our own culture as representing the ultimate truth that defines objective reality, and not just another culture-specific, subjective interpretation of the actual reality that is out there. And further, this is because we all have both the need and the ability to rationalize and justify our own particular cultural adaptation in that reality. Humans as self-conscious beings to be confident and successful in the world require a sense of correct knowledge and understanding of that world. Through culture, we all rationalize to achieve and maintain our shared group

knowledge and understanding of reality and, thus, our shared group adaptation to that reality. Surveys have shown that over seventy percent of the people in this society "know" that angels exist, but do we agree on what we think angles are? We all use our own version of cultural knowledge, not only to meet our immediate material needs, but also to apprehend the reality that we, as humans, are not fully capable of comprehending. Rationalizing through culture, then, enables humans to turn a potentially cross-cultural, objective knowledge of culture-specific ignorance into the subjective, culture-specific, ignorant knowledge that is the ethnocentrism of individuals in each cultural adaptation. Further, the material success of any specific cultural adaptation lulls its practitioners into believing that they must know the "truth" about the reality from which they, as cultural animals, are successfully satisfying their material needs. Humans as the cultural animals are also, then, the rationalizing animals. Much of that rationalizing is based on culture-specific knowledge and ends up being unconsciously ethnocentric.

In our own culture, as in all others, many rationalizations have become firmly embedded as obvious truths and hidden from us as the subjective, culture-specific and ethnocentric rationalizations that they actually are. This reality is much easier to see in other cultures than it is to see in our own. Magic, a significant cultural rationalization in many cultural adaptations, is not accepted by many as a reality-based, cause-and-effect relationship because it always works, but because the practitioners of magic are culturally understood to be, in the final analysis, human and, therefore, unsuccessful some of the time. Magic is Truth; all who would use magic, including witches, shamans and everyday people, are imperfect. What athletic coach worthy of his team's respect does not have a "lucky tie," "lucky socks" or something else "lucky" to bring to every game? A little piece of ritualized behavior can also produce "luck." But does the team win every game? What has to be rationalized by the individual is not magic itself, which already

is a firmly established cultural rationalization and, therefore, "True," but only why, in reality, it does not work every time. When prayers are not answered, it does not normally bring the reality and efficacy of a god into question. Rather, the failure of everyone who prays to that god, including ministers and even high priests, must be and is constantly rationalized away. "God works in strange and mysterious ways..." And this kind of subjective, culture-specific rationalizing is why every specific culture can make abundant sense from the inside of that culture, but appears to lack some degree of rationality and credibility when viewed from the outside. The ability to rationalize from and with enculturated knowledge is why we humans have the natural tendency to be ethnocentric, but also why there are so many different cultural adaptations that are all successful in the same real world. There is more than one way to rationalize the skinning of a cat.

A critical result of this universally found tendency to be ethnocentric is that many individuals in every human group, and most in some, unconsciously understand or even consciously know, culturally different others, no matter what their degree of biological similarity or difference, to be inherently inadequate or fundamentally inferior human beings. Why? "Because they are not like us; they do not know what we know; they have not achieved what we have achieved; but most importantly, they do not value what we value, the way we value it." Culture-specific differences get ethnocentrically rationalized into meaningful cross-cultural differences. When obvious physical differences are also involved, ethnocentrism can lead, in the extreme case, to the perception of culturally different others as both culturally and biologically inferior. And now we have added ideological racism to cultural ethnocentrism through the rationalized link of "determinism." Determinism is an assumed, absolute cause-and-effect relationship.

Ideological racists believe ethnocentrically in their racial purity and cultural superiority as a deterministically linked reality, when in fact there can be no such thing as a pure race or a universally superior culture and certainly not a deterministic link between these two non-realities. We could not be the single species that we are, if there were genetically isolated "pure" populations among us that have maintained their imagined purity since their origins. Further, there can be no universally superior culture, because cultures are adaptations, and adaptations are always situational and specific. A group of cultural animals with a universally "superior" cultural adaptation requires that there be at least one other group with a different and therefore universally "inferior" cultural adaptation. In order for both of these groups to be surviving as cultural animals, however, they must have functionally successful cultural adaptations for each of their specific situations. One can compare specifics aspects of culture and talk about "better" relative to specific situations, but a universally "inferior" or "superior" culture, the way ideological racists use the concept, is simply not possible.

In the final analysis all culture is relative. A so-called "superior culture" can only be understood, cross-culturally, as its own culture-specific, ethnocentric rationalization. When human groups are in direct competition with each other, a rationalized belief in the cultural superiority of one cultural adaptation can be used by its group to rationalize the destruction and replacement of another. Human groups do not choose to be destroyed and replaced. They can, however, willfully choose to adapt. Therefore, the destruction and replacement of another group and its otherwise successful cultural adaptation against its collective will clearly indicates a moral inferiority in a supposedly "superior" culture. Human superiority cannot be claimed by the inhumane. Social Darwinism is a culture-specific, ethnocentric rationalization, not a "universal fact of nature." Further, this myth is an affront to Charles Darwin, whose name has

been appropriated to lend an air of scientific respectability to its ethnocentric ignorance. The ultimate human tragedy is a mutual, culture-specific, ethnocentric ignorance that requires two socio-cultural groups to defend their conflicting, mutually "absolute," interpretations of the same reality to the death. "Why can't we all just learn how to live together?" That kind of learning, because of our nature as cultural animals, is much harder to achieve than many of us want to realize. Educators tend to believe that formal education can teach almost anything to anybody, especially children, who are frequently seen as "empty vessels" waiting to be filled up with "proper knowledge." The children with whom educators deal are never "empty vessels" and "proper knowledge" is seldom as obviously "proper" to children as it is to their teachers, who are frequently unaware of their own ethnocentrism, even in obvious cross-cultural situations.

Unlike teachers, however, ideological racists are extremely ethnocentric and proud of it. They "know" that nothing can be done to change the reality of racial and cultural inferiority, because they see these two qualities as deterministically linked. These true racists argue for the separation or even elimination of groups they know to be bio-culturally inferior. Many others, whose biases and "racist-like" behavior stem from their unconscious ethnocentrism and not from ideological racism, however, believe that "proper education" can address the problem of inferior or inadequate culture. Unfortunately, some of our most devoted educators think this way.

Our larger "enlightened society" tends to believe in this kind of enculturative education fix, as well, encouraging early intervention, and in extreme cases, actually removing children from their primary enculturative environment to better achieve their "proper education." This rationalizing includes the current belief that it is far too expensive to "fix" the problem by attempting to improve the primary enculturative environment itself, or by spending more, not less, on the education of those who would appear to require enculturative education the most. In

our past, however, a generation of Native American children was forced to attend government "boarding schools" at public expense, so that enculturative education could be used in an attempt to acculturate and "civilize" these "pupils," through directed learning from the ethnocentric perspective of our own dominating culture. But, of course, "we did it for their own good." Although as "Americans," many of us would die rather than allow something like that to happen to our own children. With the Native American children, this "educational" process "helped" a few and seriously "harmed" many. But it is amazing what humans can do when they "know" they are "right"—even fly loaded passenger airplanes into populated buildings in an attempt to terrorize an undesirable nation, or work to exterminate an undesirable people using gas chambers or, in an "American" example, through the distribution of smallpox infected blankets by the U.S. Cavalry as a "final solution" for the "Indian problem."

This universally found achievement of ethnocentric ignorance through the enculturation of subjective, culture-specific knowledge that is valued as if it were objective and universally true, represents the " Great Conundrum of Culture," as anthropologists have come to understand it from the cross-cultural, analytical perspective of scientific anthropology. The more individuals know "for sure" from within their own specific cultural adaptation—that is, the better and more complete their enculturation—the less they seem to be able to actually know and understand cross-culturally. And further, the less likely they are to initiate, accept or even tolerate cultural innovation and change for themselves and their own cultural group, especially when it is seen as coming from the outside. As a general rule, however, the more materially based and obviously practical a specific culture innovation or change is, the more likely it is to be rationalized into any specific cultural adaptation. Many "churches" of Old Order Amish, who continue to reject the internal combustion engine for transportation as being too "worldly," have accepted horse

drawn, gasoline powered, hay balers, because excess hay production cannot be sold in today's agricultural marketplace, unless it is baled.

It is the great conundrum of culture that also provides a cross-cultural, objective explanation for the culture-specific, subjective rationalization of most forms of imperialism, economic exploitation, slavery, racism, genocide, ethnocide, holy warfare, racial and cultural suppression and all the other kinds and levels of hatred, prejudice, domination, injustice and misunderstanding between and among human groups. Why is the infant mortality rate in Harlem as high as it is in some third-world countries? What culture-specific rationalizations are offered—and believed—for this reality by the dominant, mainstream, middle-class culture of this society so that a majority of Americans can go on valuing themselves as the "greatest and best" society the world has ever known? What ethnocentric ignorance has our globalized economic adaptation and material success viewed from around the world created for us here at home? Why didn't we see the second terrorists' attack on the World Trade Center coming? In the new global economy, one group's economic success can be seen as another group's exploitation or domination. In America we tend to focus on winning, while ignoring the impact of that winning on the losers. "Losing is their problem." Terrorism is a tool for those who are losing, and now it has become our problem, because we are winning and acting like it all over the world. If genuine humility is rare in individuals, it is almost non-existent in nation-states.

Further, it is the ethnocentrism of many of us that tends to understand and explain social "evils," as the practices of "others," who are "bad" people, or even just "ignorant" people under the influence of "evil forces"—or as some would have us believe, a product of the "ultimate and universal" evil itself, the "devil" incarnate. From an anthropological, cross-cultural perspective, however, many, if not all, of these "social evils" can be understood as a consequence of the very

nature and ethnocentric ignorance of humans as cultural animals out to competitively sustain and advance themselves through their own cultural adaptation and consequently, more often than not, at the expense of culturally and, culturally defined, racially different others. Public school teachers in our "freedom loving," "multicultural" society and "economically interdependent" world must understand that a real "evil" humanity needs to fear and struggle against cross-culturally is the ethnocentric ignorance generated by the enculturation of culture-specific knowledge, including some of their own. And as educators, they stand in an excellent position to address this universally found "evil" in pursuit of their own professional activities.

Furthermore, as applied to public education in this society, it is a fundamental principle of pedagogical anthropology that ethnocentrically perceived "inadequacies" of culturally different others cannot be successfully addressed by attempts at enculturative education into an idealized, mainstream, "American," middle-class culture, with or without "multicultural" content. This is the strategy pursued in many of our public school classrooms today, because student "inadequacies" tend to be rationalized by ethnocentric teachers as racial, ethnic, class or even gender "differences" that can and should be corrected through "proper" education. The conundrum of culture, working through some of the most thoroughly enculturated, culturally dominating, mainstream, middle-class members of our society--public school teachers--negatively influences the process. The result is ethnocentric teaching creating a failure of the formal teaching-learning process for far too many students, especially traditional "minorities" and other culturally diverse groups. These students end up missing out, to varying degrees, on an essential educational component of their basic and necessary enculturative experience.

Humans never stop learning. But human children in our complex, polycultural society are being driven away from formal learning in public schools in ever increasing numbers as a

result of failure—surely their own, but unfortunately their teachers' as well. And it is ethnocentric teaching that lies at the heart of all this failure. It has little to do with teachers who are inadequately prepared in subject matter or even teaching methodology as currently claimed. Too many of our otherwise competent teachers are pedagogically ethnocentric, and their cross-culturally ignorant teaching is less than effective, when a more appropriate cross-cultural pedagogy is required for any chance of achieving greater success. The great conundrum of culture is producing failure in our classrooms, and we need to do something about it. We need to better understand the educational losers and the ethnocentrically based cross-cultural dissonance that is creating them. More testing of both students and teachers is simply not the answer. More appropriate education for both groups, however, **is** the answer, although we must start with the latter to successfully reach the former.

It took early anthropologists themselves a while to catch on to this great conundrum of culture. The scholars associated with the first theoretical "school" in the discipline back in the second half of the nineteenth century, the Cultural Evolutionists, were eventually accused of being extremely ethnocentric and even racist. This was because they attempted to understand and explain other cultures as "undeveloped," "primitive," and inherently "ignorant" versions of their own "evolved," "civilized" and, because they were doing the studying, "enlightened" culture. Yet these first anthropologists did establish "culture" as the salient and defining concept of the discipline while winning the intellectual fight against "degeneration"—a religiously inspired ethnocentric explanation for cultural differences. Even with their faults, these first anthropologists did succeed in starting the scholarly, academic and scientific ball of anthropology rolling into the twentieth-century. But that is how disciplines work: they develop and evolve.

To understand human culture better in general, as well as specific versions of it, however, anthropologists at the start of the twentieth century realized that they were going to have to leave their own culture-specific knowledge with its ethnocentric biases behind and achieve a more neutral, cross-cultural, analytical, perspective on all cultures, including their own. They were going to have to do a better job of being objective and scientific, rather than subjective and ethnocentric, about the study of human culture. To this end they adopted an anti-ethnocentric doctrine of "cultural relativism," arguing that the meaning and value of cultural knowledge and behavior must be understood relative to the specific socio-culture group in which it is found. This meant that each culture must be understood and described in its own terms by studying it from the inside. These culturally specific descriptions of other cultures produced by anthropologists, based upon their actual fieldwork living and studying in the other cultures themselves, are known as ethnographies. Today, scientific anthropologists use data from these basic ethnographies or from more focused ethnographic research in specific cultural situations for comparative, cross-cultural analysis to produce and test generalizations and explanations about specific cultures and human culture in general as a bio-cultural phenomenon. Anthropologists attempt to approach the study of human biology and culture and the interaction of these two phenomena from the unique, holistic, cross-cultural perspective of scientific anthropology or from what has become known as an "anthropological point of view."

Teachers need to be educated and trained to use the techniques of ethnography to get out of the classroom and into the homes and communities of all their students. They need to interview parents and students as families. They need to observe and as invited guests participate in important community events. And they need to make this qualitative descriptive information available to fellow teachers through an in-school computerized database.

Knowledge of where students are "coming from"—and thus the culture-specific knowledge required for successfully directing their learning—can only come from where those students **are** actually coming from. Learning to use the approach and techniques of ethnography to understand their students, and then actually applying what they have learned to their teaching, rather than simply taking a college course or an in-service workshop in "multiculturalism," is an essential step toward learning to teach successfully in "multicultural" classrooms. Further, teachers visiting student homes and communities, especially in urban centers where many teachers commute from the suburbs, will help to integrate public education into the full range of socio-cultural environments it is currently expected to serve. This second major integration is desperately needed to help improve teaching-learning success in our public schools. The first major integration of public education, where it has actually been achieved, is simply not adequate.

Our larger society must find the resources to support the necessary additional training and expanded efforts of its teachers, and in many cases these resources cannot be found on the local level. As a society we need to consider strengthening the professionalism of public school teachers, especially those working in "troubled" or "difficult" schools, by expanding their contracts to year-round service with a proportional increase in their salaries. This ability to increase annual income, while continuing to work in their chosen profession, can attract some of our more successful teachers back into the schools that need them, while encouraging others not to leave in the first place. Summer "vacation" is the additional paid time "at work" teachers need to better prepare for the regular academic year and to continue their own education. Further incentives, such as the excuse of property taxes and low interest mortgages, can encourage these teachers to become homeowners in and members of the communities where they are actually

serving. Of course, this kind of teaching as "community service" is not for everyone, but there must be rewards for those who are capable and accept the challenge. There are no viable reasons why this new level of professional capabilities and competence should not be established for public school teachers.

Further, in "needy" schools, teachers must be given increased staff support by educationally related specialists based in the school, including community mental and public health workers, social workers, developmental psychologists and one or more pedagogical anthropologists. These latter specialists in applied educational anthropology need to be specially trained to assist administrators, staff and teachers alike on all educationally related cross-cultural issues and matters, including the actual practice of cross-cultural pedagogy. They also need to be the primary representative of the school in its associated communities, and the primary representative of the associated communities in the school. This two-way intermediary role across cultural borders is one that applied anthropologists are uniquely prepared to perform.

Finally, we must find practical ways to enhance the administration of underachieving schools with enlightened educational leadership—surely no mean task, especially in bureaucratically overladen urban systems. Administrators must develop the ability to lead a professional staff of in-house specialists collectively addressing the developmental and educational problems of each specific student on a case-by-case basis. If Johnny or Ramon or Tanisha is not learning, early and appropriate intervention by a school-based staff of professional specialists with the support of at least one parent or guardian is the most efficient, humane and, in the long run, economical approach, both for the individual child and for our larger society.

In this day and age, all children must acquire the personal identity, cultural knowledge and critical thinking skills necessary, not just for success in their immediate socio-cultural

environments, but also for survival and success in the larger, complex, ever-changing and interdependent physical, biological and socio-cultural worlds that our species as a whole has been and is continuing to create for them. Any lesser goal for modern public education in a free society is unworthy of the intellectual and moral heights to which we humans as a species aspire. In today's culturally diverse world, "human freedom" is being redefined as an awareness and understanding of the full range of cultural alternatives available to each human being, along with the individual ability and opportunity to make intelligent, informed choices in this new polycultural reality. The opportunity for cross-culturally aware, culturally adaptive choice by the individual is rapidly becoming a universally sought-after human right. Freedom, both political and intellectual, **is** a highly desirable state of being for humans everywhere. Public education can and should be the path to achieving this newly found human freedom.

Yet the attempt of any group or community to enculturate its children, the attempt of any society or nation-state to educate its citizens, even in our shrinking, economically interdependent, "multicultural" world, has been traditionally, and continues to be, a culture-specific, ethnocentric process. Herein lie both the larger problem and the larger challenge for modern public education in this so called "free" society. The transmission of shared ethnocentrism is not the path to a universal human freedom. Understanding this problem and meeting its challenges represent the necessary and sufficient reform of public education so desperately sought and so ineffectively pursued in our society today. At the heart of this urgently needed reform is a better understanding by classroom teachers of the anthropological concept of culture and its implications for their success or failure in pursuit of the formal teaching-learning process for all their students. A new pedagogy of cross-cultural teaching is

clearly required to replace the ethnocentric teaching that drives the enculturative experience in many of our public schools today.

When the cultural orientation a student brings to the classroom, as a result of previous and ongoing enculturation in the home and immediate community, reflects significant "racial," ethnic, religious, class and/or philosophical diversity and, as a result, differs in varying degrees with the dominant, mainstream, middle-class, American, cultural orientation presented in the curriculum and represented by the teacher in the classroom, then traditional approaches to teaching can be and frequently are less than effective. In short, a formal teaching-learning process based on a culture-specific, enculturative model that works for culturally compatible students, can fail other more culturally diverse students in the same classroom, because of identifiable cultural conflicts and biases in the teaching-learning process itself. Sometimes, depending on the school population, this traditional approach to teaching can end up failing most of the students in the school. Yet out of both culture-specific and cross-cultural ignorance teachers tend to blame individual students and, unfortunately, the different socio-cultural groups those students are seen to represent. Further, the larger society tends to blame individual teachers for all this ethnocentrically based, cross-cultural failure, but for all the wrong reasons.

To achieve the required, teaching-success oriented, reform of public education, existing teacher preparation must be supplemented with specific content from pedagogical anthropology designed to prepare teachers to approach the teaching-learning process armed intellectually with the cross-cultural perspective, knowledge and bio-cultural understanding of human enculturation available through modern scientific anthropology. And this must include in-service, as well as college-based, teacher education and certification. In short, public school teachers must be taught how to approach their teaching from an anthropological point of view. Teachers must

learn how to function successfully in the classroom and larger school communities, in the same way that anthropologists have learned to function successfully in the field, by bringing their ethnocentrism under control. To better illustrate the approach of pedagogical anthropology that I am advocating, I will briefly review some educational basics from the cross-cultural perspective of scientific anthropology or from what I have identified as an anthropological point of view.

Essentially, education is directed learning, and teaching is the process of directing that learning. School then is the place where directed learning formally occurs, and schooling becomes the process of formal education. Teaching is a basic and natural human behavior that can, has and does go on between any two human beings as long as they are able to communicate. Indeed, if they do not share a common language, and they both want to learn from each other, the first thing humans usually do is fall back onto some less culture-specific means of communication, such as gesture, and begin to teach each other their respective languages. The common goal is to facilitate an expanded and shared cross-cultural teaching-learning experience. Shared language is a prerequisite for success in directed learning. And directed learning, especially across cultural borders, is more likely to succeed, when it is perceived and pursued as a sharing process. Anthropologists in the field, as cross-cultural "learners," employ a reciprocal strategy by getting informants to share their specific cultural knowledge as "teachers."

People who teach informally by sharing what they know—parents, relatives, friends, co-workers or colleagues—are usually not identified, at least in this society, as teachers, but they are a major source of continuing enculturation. In our modern complex society, teachers are usually seen as fulltime specialists who receive education, training and professional certification in the formal process of directing learning in public schools. These professional teachers are frequently referred to as educators. Many politicians and parents, however, who are products of our

educational system, by virtue of their having spent years in the classroom on the receiving end of the formal teaching-learning process, believe that they know as much about teaching as most educators. Further, teachers sometimes assume that parents who are not products of our system know and understand more about American public education than they actually do. Teachers must learn how to do more cross-cultural educating about schooling outside of their classrooms. Schools tend to be subdivided into classes with usually only one teacher given responsibility for teaching (directing learning in) a classroom of learners. The number of learners in the classroom is usually greater than research indicates it should be, especially in schools where diversity demands more, not less, individualized instruction. The learners in the classroom are generally referred to as students. Technically, however, the label, "pupil," more accurately implies the directive authority of teachers and the participatory status and responsibilities of students in the formal schooling situation.

While the education that goes on in public schools today is generally understood and approached by teachers as if it were an extended, expanded and enriched form of enculturation, the original and primary source of basic enculturation for a child in this society remains the child's family and its immediate social-cultural community of friends, playmates and acquaintances. The role of adults outside the school in this process must not be overlooked or minimized. In fact, it needs to be capitalized upon and integrated into the schooling experience.

Modern consumer-based techno-entertainment is currently expanding a child's socio-cultural community through more culture-specific programming and content on both television and the Internet. The more commercial and public the Internet becomes, the more culture-specific, yet polycultural, its content will be. Wouldn't current television executives love to have a medium that permitted multiple, culture-specific versions of the same basic program to be

"broadcast" simultaneously to "different targeted audiences," or better yet, available at different times selected by different individuals in those targeted audiences? The evolving Internet permits this and, as a result, has the potential to contribute significantly to the existing ethnocentric divisiveness in our larger society. Commercialism trains our children to seek and choose entertainment in an informal, familiar context, rather than education in a more formal, unfamiliar context. And programs like Sesame Street have trained many of our children to find school boring, if it is not also very entertaining. Producing quality entertainment takes much more money than we make available to our public schools—so much for the great educational promise of television. As a graduate student, I was introduced to the exciting educational potential of computers. And now the Internet is our next great educational hope. We need to be working to place teachers who are educated and trained in cross-cultural pedagogy into public school classrooms with the same enthusiasm we now have for providing Internet access. The former, not the latter, can produce the kind of teaching-learning success we are seeking.

Much of a child's continuing enculturation, then, even after entering school, is the product of informal learning through practical experience and social interaction with known, accepted and culturally valued individuals, rather than the result of formal teaching by professional educators in the frequently authoritarian, often impersonal, and sometimes even alien, socio-cultural environment of the public school classroom. Sometimes humans as primates just need a hug. For children, the teaching-learning process must to be a personal-social experience. But hugging or touching children reassuringly, approvingly or affectionately or getting too close personally or socially in other ways is not advised in many public schools today. And it is even less likely to occur across cultural borders. For too many teachers and too

many students in too many public schools, the classroom has become a cold, impersonal, even foreign, place, impeding, rather than supporting, the human teaching-learning process.

In some cases even the language, including dialect, spoken in the home and with friends in school, and the language required in the classroom, are not the same. And school English is frequently presented as a clearly superior alternative. But there are no universally superior or inferior languages. Every human language works perfectly well for its native speakers and deserves respect, including so-called Black English. Like so many other things taught in school that can be seen by some students as somewhat alien or culturally undesirable, however, the reality is that school English is essential for success, both in school and in the larger society. In cross-cultural pedagogy, this essential language—School English—needs to be taught as a culture-adaptive situational alternative and not a superior cultural replacement for a child's native language.

Many students from diverse backgrounds are simply not able to appreciate the long-term consequences of the conscious and unconscious learning choices they are constantly making in school as a result of the culture-specific preferences and biases they bring to the formal teaching-learning process. Personal choice is an inalienable right in consumer America—our competitive commercialism demands it—and children learn this at a very early age. It is surprising how many children believe that they know, better than their teachers, what is best for them. Teacher ethnocentrism does not help either. In the extreme case, some students actually end up reinforcing their own socio-cultural identity by choosing, either consciously or unconsciously, **not** to learn certain things that are essential for their success in school and the larger society.

As a result of these and other cultural realities in our public schools, many students can be more successful at learning one-to-one from a just slightly older, culturally compatible peer

under the direction of a teacher, than they are at learning from less than culturally compatible teachers attempting to direct their learning in traditional classrooms. And this also applies when they are attempting to learning school English as a second language. Of course, this alternative approach to teaching "makes more work" in preparation and direction for the teacher and requires a sharing of some degree of teaching authority with the selected learning-aide. That is probably why this proven strategy, among others, for successfully teaching across cultural borders is not more widely utilized—that, and the ethnocentric ignorance and rationalized laziness of many teachers. All humans everywhere work to achieve material ends—in this case a paycheck—with the least amount of time and effort expended in each culturally perceived and rationalized work activity.

Schooling in America has evolved out of an original desire of small, rather homogeneous, local, socio-cultural communities to enhance the enculturation of their children through formal education. Public schooling, as it exists in this polycultural society today, however, is for many of its students, no longer the traditional, community-based, enculturative experience that many "Americans" want to continue believing it is. Culturally diverse children are now forced, at a very early age, to adapt culturally to, rather than simply participation in, what is intended to be a major component of their basic enculturative experience. Many socially desirable, culturally attractive, non-school alternatives are available to these students for their continuing enculturation, including, in urban neighborhoods, "the street" in general, and "gangs" in particular. It is not surprising, then, that many of these children do not succeed in the classroom at the same level as students more culturally compatible with the culture-specific—and frequently presented by ethnocentric teachers as universally "correct," "true" and "proper"—enculturative experiences found in most public schools today.

Public school teachers, especially in densely populated, polycultural urban centers, must realize and understand the extent to which modern school-based education, along with their participation in the teaching-learning process that is at its heart, has deviated from the traditional enculturative experience that has sustained our species ever since its biological and cultural origins back in the dawn of human prehistory. It is this **difference** in the way we are evolved to be enculturated and the way we now seek to formally educate many of our children that explains much of the teaching-learning failure in our public school classrooms today. If we as a society would seek to ameliorate the problem of school failure, if we truly wish to make public education more successful for all of our students, then at the very least those actively engaged in attempting to formally direct the learning process—classroom teachers—must be given a better understanding of the culture-specific and cross-cultural realities under which they are currently expected to practice their chosen profession. One cannot hope to direct complex learning in the equally complex socio-cultural environments of our public schools, without an in-depth understanding of the anthropological concept of culture, including its implications for the human teaching-learning process, especially when diverse cultural orientations are forced to come together in the classroom for a common enculturative experience in the name of a "common good," the way they are today. The problem is that the common good is "gooder" for some than it is for others. I say again for emphasis: **Public school teachers must be prepared to approach their teaching from the modern, holistic, cross-cultural perspective of scientific anthropology or from what has been called an anthropological point of view so that they can consciously work against the ethnocentric teaching that impedes directed learning across cultural borders.**

And again, enculturation is a culture-specific, not a cross-cultural, process. The enculturative education supported by directed learning in our public schools today is intended to prepare all of our children to assume productive and responsible roles as adults and citizens in our larger nation-state society and economically interdependent and shrinking world. To accomplish this, public education attempts to collectively enculturate classrooms of students into the clearly successful, mainstream American, socio-cultural adaptation, affectionately referred to in our larger society as, "the American way of life." We do this through learning directed by teachers previously, and it is hoped thoroughly, enculturated into this same dominant, mainstream, middle-class, uniquely "American," highly idealized, but ethnocentrically rationalized, cultural adaptation of which this society is so proud.

But we do not live in a monocultural society. There is no single American socio-cultural adaptation. The American way of life consists of many unique and specific socio-cultural adaptations worked out collectively by specific individuals, with their families and through their local socio-cultural communities, each employing enculturated traditions, educated knowledge, borrowed culture, modified beliefs, rationalized values and continued practical problem-solving in the very real world that is our culturally complex, extremely diverse and constantly changing society. As a people we profess a belief in individual freedom. The old model of public schooling as continued culture-specific enculturation through ethnocentric teaching—almost training—that has sustained public education in this society throughout its formative years, is no longer working for larger and larger numbers of culturally diverse children. Many are being seriously disadvantaged by public education's ignorance of the cross-cultural knowledge and perspective vis-à-vis pedagogy available from one hundred and fifty years of anthropological research through the interdisciplinary focus of pedagogical anthropology. And freedom suffers.

Public school teachers must be given intensive education in the anthropological concept of culture, the bio-cultural basis of the human teaching-learning process, and the specific skills and practices from both anthropology and education that will permit and enable them to approach the challenge of successfully directing student learning in the classrooms of our polycultural society from the scientific perspective of a more cross-culturally objective, anthropological point of view. Teachers need to learn how to work with and around the great conundrum of culture. They need to replace the traditional and outmoded model of public schooling as enculturative education supported by culture-specific, ethnocentric teaching with a new cross-culturally aware model of culture-adaptive education achieved through cross-cultural teaching appropriate for the new millennium and global society we are now entering. The socio-cultural institution of public education in this society requires directed culture change. And it desperately needs that change to start happening right now. Further, the imperative for this reform goes far beyond the teachers and students who are directly involved.

With a competitive global economy—remember the ideal of "free" enterprise and "free" trade involves "unbridled" competition—a truly cooperative world society becomes a necessity for the survival of our species, and probably our planet, as well. Unbridled economic competition has always been both environmentally and socio-culturally destructive. It is true that the vast majority of all the species that have ever evolved on the earth have already gone extinct. In our brief evolutionary history, however, we have been and continue to be responsible for the extinction of many of the reduced number of species that were still around when we first appeared on the scene some 150,000 to 200,000 years ago. As the cultural animals, not only have we succeeded in domesticating the other animals, as well as plants, that we required for the growth and expansion of "Our Kind" all over the earth, but we have also succeeded in

domesticating ourselves through the general socio-cultural adaptation known by anthropologists as civilization. The early city-states that evolved with this adaptation called civilization, not just once, but several times in several different regions, beginning human history, were followed inevitably in those different regions by a series of ever expanding empires and later a proliferation of sovereign nation-states. In the century just past, these nation-states gave our species two world wars and regional and inter-regional conflicts too numerous to account. This sequence of civilization-based, culture-specific bio-cultural adaptations is now being replaced, as were the simple band society, tribe, and chiefdom adaptations before them.

Today humans are on the threshold of a new adaptive era. Throughout our entire prehistory and history as a species, all of our socio-cultural group adaptations have been sustained by the enculturation of culture-specific knowledge rationalized through ethnocentric ignorance. The constant transmission and modification of all this diverse cultural knowledge has served our species well, resulting in the truly spectacular accomplishments of our present state of bio-cultural evolution. Unfortunately, throughout this same period the associated wealth of culture-specific, ethnocentric ignorance has also been responsible for the untimely death and destruction of countless numbers of human beings as well as many, otherwise successful, culture-specific, bio-cultural adaptations. What ever happened to the Tasmanians and the Mandan and so many other long forgotten peoples? Is "victims of progress" a rationalization?

Recently, however—over the past two hundred to three hundred years—the evolving civilizations have developed science as a widely applied intellectual tool for controlling our previously evolved ability to rationalize through culture. As a result, our species has achieved the capacity to investigate and "know" our world more effectively, more efficiently and more completely than any of our earlier socio-cultural adaptations have ever permitted. This new way

of knowing, applied enthusiastically to the age old problem of meeting our material needs, has given, at least some of our species, a material security and success unequaled in our short evolutionary history.

Science as a human way of knowing, added onto the older cultural ways of knowing, has also permitted humans to investigate and understand their very nature as the cultural animals that produced this new and improved intellectual tool for achieving ongoing socio-cultural adaptation. Through science and the "Human Genome Project," the biological evolution of our species that led to the evolution of culture as a better way of adapting, is now itself being brought under more consciously directed, adaptive control. We are rapidly becoming the first species ever to gain conscious, rational control over its ongoing adaptation and, as a result, its evolution. It is the cultural invention and application of science as a cross-cultural—almost "super-cultural"—way of knowing that is making all this possible. But will we, as the bio-culturally diverse species that we are, find the wisdom and the common humanity to make it work? Science is only an intellectual, socio-culturally adaptive tool. It is not a human way of life. It can inform the process of valuing, but it cannot direct or determine that process. Creating and sharing values to live by is a human philosophical and religious process that must be used to unite the spiritually experienced and imagined with the scientifically understood and explained across socio-cultural and, socio-culturally defined, racial borders. It is human nature to both believe spiritually and know scientifically. And science can only address half of this equation.

Today, as never before, however, it is imperative that we use this new way of adapting through culture called science, this new half of the human adapting equation, to invent and develop a new public education for our modern polycultural society and world. We must take public education out from under the control of culture-specific tradition. America is truly the

polycultural, multiracial future of the world. If human freedom can survive and continue its development here—and this is by no means assured—there is hope for the rest of humanity. And our public education system is the key.

This new public education, then, must be an education in which student and teacher alike are not victimized by the conundrum of culture. It must be an education oriented toward learning to adapt culturally through problem solving, rather than learning the traditional, culture-specific knowledge and ethnocentrism of a dominant socio-cultural adaptation though dictation, rote, recitation and testing. It must be an education that replaces ethnocentric teaching with a new cross-cultural pedagogy. Both teachers and eventually their students must learn how to solve practical problems in the real culturally and racially diverse world armed with the cross-culturally objective, critical-thinking perspectives and approaches of modern physical, biological, behavioral, and socio-cultural science. It must be an education that enculturates human children into a socio-cultural adaptation of cross-cultural knowledge and awareness through sharing, that is our collective heritage as the evolved cultural animals. And it must be an education that includes a cross-cultural consideration of religious and philosophical approaches to human spirituality. It must be an education that permits individuals to adapt culturally through choice, while offering, along with the great diversity of culture-specific identities, first and foremost an individual identity as a human being with a culturally based, cross-culturally shared humanity. We must begin to educate citizens of the world, responsible to the world, for the world and its other citizens. And we must begin this process with our current public school teachers by addressing their culture-specific, ethnocentric teaching. It is possible to educate citizens of both a nation-state and the world as long as the explicit and implicit goals of that

nation-state expressed in the overt and covert behavior of its citizens are not the bio-culturally adaptive domination and exploitation of the rest of that world.

Most of the basic knowledge required for the creation and development of this new culture-adaptive education supported by cross-cultural teaching currently exists in the disciplines of anthropology and education. But the actual practice of this educational innovation is going have to be researched and developed by the very classroom teachers, who desperately need the reformation of the traditional teaching-learning process that this innovation represents. Including the content and perspective of the interdisciplinary field of pedagogical anthropology in the educational preparation and in-service experience of public school teachers everywhere is a first and essential step in that direction. I am currently preparing a basic text, An Introduction to Pedagogical Anthropology and Cross-Cultural Teaching for Public Educators, in support of this endeavor. A collection of selected readings from both anthropology and education supporting the development of the actual practice of this innovation in public education is planned to follow.

Further, I stand ready and willing to devote the remainder of my professional career as an anthropological educator and specialist in pedagogical anthropology, working with other educators and educationally oriented social, behavioral and bio-cultural applied scientists in this humanely necessary undertaking. The institution of public education in this society is inflicting mental and emotional damage on many of our students and teachers every day. Reform is essential. Together, not only can we take the first step, but we can also proceed collectively and cooperatively down the road toward the new culture-adaptive education supported by cross-cultural teaching that all of our public school teachers, as well as their students, so desperately need and deserve. Great things only happen when human beings come together for a common purpose, sharing a common vision, motivated by a common will. I truly hope that our larger

society in general and at least some of my colleagues in education and the applied human sciences in particular are up to the creative challenge that stands so clearly before us.

I have not provided citations to document any of the ideas reviewed or presented in this essay. My intent here was and is not to impress scholars and academics, but to speak as clearly and directly as possible to practically oriented educators and applied scientists—and especially classroom teachers. Scholarly citations can interfere with the explication of important ideas. Many good anthropologists and educators have influenced my thinking over the years—as well as some not so good ones. Let me close by giving those of you who have stayed with me through this demanding, teaching-learning experience and might be interested in going further, some selected references for continuing your own self-education in pedagogical anthropology and cross-cultural teaching. When you review these works you will begin to understand the great intellectual debt that I owe to all my teachers past and present:

- For a readable introduction to the anthropological concept of culture and an anthropological point of view – Culture as Given, Culture as Choice, by Dirk van der Elst, with Paul Bohannan; published in 1999 by Waveland Press Inc., P.O. Box 400, Prospect Heights, Illinois 60070; (847) 634-0081
- For an extensive, but lively and enjoyable, general and personal view of anthropological knowledge by a distinguished anthropologist – Our Kind: Who We Are, Where We Come From, and Where We Are Going, by Marvin Harris, published in 1989 by Harper & Row, Publishing, Inc., New York
- For an introduction to ethnography and the ethnographic experience – Asking and Listening: Ethnography as Personal Adaptation, by Paul Bohannan and Dirk van der Elst;

published in 1998 by Waveland Press Inc., P.O. Box 400, Prospect Heights, Illinois 60070; (847) 634-0081.

- For an anthropological approach to diversity – The Challenge of Human Diversity, by DeWight R. Middleton; published in 1998 by Waveland Press Inc., P.O. Box 400, Prospect Heights, Illinois 60070; (847) 634-0081.
- For a popular look at science as a way of knowing by one of the all-time great teachers of science – The Demon-Haunted World: Science as a Candle in the Dark, by Carl Sagan, published in 1997 by Ballantine Books, New York.
- For a polycultural view of American history by a distinguished historian – A Peoples History of the United States: 1492—Present, by Howard Zinn, published in 1995 (revised and enlarged edition – original in 1980) by HarperPerennial, a division of HarperCollins Publishers, Inc., New York.
- For an anthropological perspective on our culture and our schools (I consider this to be an important text for teachers) – The American Cultural Dialogue and its Transmission, by George and Louise Spindler, with Henry Trueba and Melvin D. Williams; published in 1990 by Taylor and Francis Inc. (originally The Falmer Press), New York, NY; (800) 634-7064.
- For a somewhat controversial (How much is true? How much is fiction?) autobiographical tale of the remembrances of life with the author's Eastern Cherokee Hill country grandparents that has a lot of insight to offer teachers concerning enculturative education both informal and formal – The Education of Little Tree, by Forrest Carter; published in 1986 (original in 1976) by the University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, New Mexico; (800) 249-7737.

- For a "classic" collection of articles offering anthropological perspectives on education (I strongly recommend the article on page 110 by Raymond P. McDermott entitled: "Achieving School Failure 1972-1997" revised for this third edition) – Education and Cultural Process: Anthropological Approaches, by George D. Spindler; published in 1997 (third edition – original in 1974) by Waveland Press, Inc., P.O. Box 400, Prospect Heights, Illinois 60070; (847) 634-0081.
- For material from education relevant to cross-cultural teaching, I can offer no specific references. The content is scattered throughout the literature of the discipline and seldom presented in the context of cross-cultural teaching. Until the text I am preparing is completed and published, if you send a $10.00 check to Queens College, Anthropology (made out to the same), ATTN: Dr. Steffy, Cross-cultural Teaching, 65-30 Kissena Boulevard, Flushing, New York 11367, to cover copying, return envelope and postage, I will send you a copy of three Student Oriented Learning Outlines (S.O.L.O.s) and accompanying resource materials (together each represents a self-instruction packet). These S.O.L.O.s review some basic educational content particularly relevant to cross-cultural teaching. Among other things, the Systems Model of Instruction, the concept and strategy of Mastery Learning, and the Principles of (Effective) Instruction are covered here. I developed these S.O.L.O.s for use in a course that I have offered to both practicing teachers and teachers in training, as well as anthropology majors: Anthro 307 – The Anthropology of Cross-cultural Teaching.

(Author's Note: I must acknowledge the particular debt, intellectual and otherwise, that I owe five of my many teachers: Maurice Mook, Warren T. Morrill, William T. Sanders, James O.

Hammons and Fabian Cayetano. The first four are mentors from my formative years in both anthropology and education. The last is a Belizean Education Officer I am proud to call a colleague and friend. All five of these outstanding teachers have taught me more than they will ever know. None-the-less I remain responsible for any inability I exhibit to adequately interpret and translate in my own writing the knowledge and wisdom they so willingly and graciously shared with me. To the students, colleagues and friends of education too numerous to list who have shared their knowledge and influenced my thinking—you know who you are—thank you, thank you, thank you!)

Associated Supplement Attached: A Fundamental Proposition of Pedagogical Anthropology along with Some Preliminary First Principles of Cross-cultural Teaching.

A Fundamental Proposition of Pedagogical Anthropology
along with
Some Preliminary First Principles of Cross-cultural Teaching

The following proposition along with its converse concerning the interaction of cultures, subcultures or "ethnicities" in public education today might help to explain some, if not most, of the unprecedented failure of the teaching-learning process that we, as a society, are encountering in some of our public schools, especially in urban centers. All other things equal in public education (and I realize that they never really are equal):

- The greater the degree of similarity or compatibility between the culture of orientation of the student and the cultural orientation of the school and its teachers, the greater the probability of educational success—that is to say, the greater the probability that the results of the teaching-learning process will be success for both the teacher involved (a sense of accomplishment and confidence as a professional educator, as well as job retention) and the student involved (a similar sense of accomplishment and confidence as a human being, as well as educationally induced growth and change recognized by the institution and its larger society with a passing grade and ultimately with a diploma).
- Conversely, the greater the degree of dissimilarity or incompatibility between the culture of orientation of the student and the cultural orientation of the school and its teachers, the greater the probability of educational failure for both the student and the teacher involved in the teaching-learning process. (Note: We already identify "at risk" students by observing this cultural dissimilarity, but we do not call it that from the ethnocentric position of public education—we tend to use a

"disadvantaged" or "underprivileged" rationale or model focusing primarily on the student from the mainstream culture-specific perspective of the school and its larger society.)

It should be noted here that it is the cultural orientation of the teacher that is most critical in this converse of the fundamental proposition of pedagogical anthropology. Clearly, we might expect a greater probability of success for both student and teacher if they possessed a greater degree of cultural compatibility with each other than either does with the school and its larger society, a situation not covered in either the proposition or its converse as stated above. Although it is conceivable that the student and the teacher could "struggle" together to teach and learn in the face of a shared cultural incompatibility with the school and its larger society, the assumption in this exception has almost got to be that the teacher is bicultural. In this way the teacher would be more or less culturally compatible with both the student's culture of orientation, and the cultural orientation of the school, even though these two differ in meaningful ways.

This, in fact, is the basis for the Bilingual Education movement, although there can be significant cultural diversity within a single major non-English speaking group. Language and culture are not necessarily coterminous. Unfortunately, truly bilingual, let alone fully bicultural, teachers are hard to come by and almost impossible to produce through the inadequate training programs that have been created to "mass produce" them. Further, as a society, we are obviously unwilling to compensate these rare, talented and extremely valuable individuals to work as classroom teachers at anywhere near the level the "market demands."—I just said we don't and can't pay them enough. Further, there is clearly no way that we can ever hope to begin providing

bicultural or even bilingual teachers to cover just a fraction of the combinations of cultural and language diversity currently found in our public schools.

My admittedly limited experience with "bilingual education" in the California system some years ago suggested to me that it functioned more politically and economically to bring marginally bilingual Spanish-speaking aides into the lower echelons of the mainstream, middle-class culture of public education through entry level employment in the public schools, than it functioned educationally to help lower-class Spanish-speaking students succeed where they were almost destined to fail. Based on what I observed in classrooms, it did seem to teach a surprising number of Spanish-speaking students that, as a result of their language difference, they could thwart, undermine and otherwise get around the teaching authority of the non-Spanish speaking teacher in charge. Students did this by manipulating or "playing-off" against the teacher, the Spanish-speaking aide, who was only in the classroom part-time, and who had only marginal English capabilities, frequently equivalent to the marginal Spanish capabilities of the teacher. The aide and the teacher were anything but the bilingual teaching-team they needed to be.

Through this inadequate form of "bilingual education," some Spanish-speaking students managed to avoid doing much of the actual schoolwork assigned in English by the teacher for the rest of the class. And they tended to get disruptive with "nothing to do" in the same classroom, while the English-speaking lesson was going on. The "bilingual" aide was supposed to "go over" the assigned work later in an abbreviated rehash of the lesson in Spanish with the Spanish-speaking students who, as a result, spent much less time actually attending to and actively engaged with the lesson compared to the English-speaking students. And the Spanish-speaking students were also supposed to be learning the English language associated with the lesson.

I know that under the best conditions, and implemented quite differently, bilingual education works. It's just hard (read "almost impossible" here) to achieve these "best conditions" everywhere bilingual education would be appropriate and is needed. Again the potential wide applicability of cross-cultural teaching, where the teacher does not have to—indeed should not—represent the culture of any one group of students in our polycultural society and culturally diverse public schools, seems to offer the best hope for improving educational success for all students. Therefore, let's take a closer look at what this thing that I am calling "cross-cultural teaching" can and should be.

Obviously, cross-cultural teaching does not now exist as a professional orientation and focus for public schools teachers. It is going to have to be invented. And it should be invented in practice by public school teachers themselves. But, in the same way that we cannot send students of cultural anthropology out into the "field" to do (read "invent" here) ethnography for themselves without proper education to prepare them intellectually for the professional doing/inventing experience, so we cannot expect ethnocentrically educated public school teachers to begin doing (read "inventing" here) cross-cultural teaching for themselves without the proper educational preparation. This education/re-education process must prepare them intellectually for the professional doing/inventing, cross-cultural teaching experience. These few pages are not the place to attempt to conduct this kind of complex directed learning experience.

I will, however, begin the process for those of you who have traveled this far with me and want to go further by reviewing a number of what I am calling, "Preliminary First Principles of Cross-cultural Teaching." By the time you are finished with this document along with the paper it was produced to support, I hope I will have convinced you that the cross-cultural teaching that can derive logically by approaching the teaching-learning process from an

anthropological point of view represents a new path to achieving greater success in directing student learning in the culturally diverse public school classrooms of our larger polycultural society.

Preliminary First Principles Of Cross-cultural Teaching

* Cross-cultural Teachers must approach education from an anthropological point of view.

Teachers who intend to direct learning in students from diverse cultural backgrounds (read "cultures of orientation different from the school's cultural orientation" here) need to develop the intellectual capacity to see, understand and approach the teaching-learning process from the cross-cultural perspective of analytical anthropology. This does not consist of learning selected "facts" about one or more "other cultures" in a "multicultural" workshop. It probably requires going back to college. Although, I did create a plan, rejected by my superiors, in which I would travel from my college out to public schools to begin conducting this kind of re-education one afternoon a week at each of four different schools for a semester long college level learning experience.

For teachers to function successfully as professional educators in our culturally diverse public schools, they must learn how to consciously and constantly work to get past the ethnocentrism that is naturally characteristic of all human beings, including well educated (read "mainstream middle-class enculturated" here) teachers. When they learn how to do this, teachers will be in a better intellectual position to deal effectively with education as the dynamic and complex—involving both enculturative and acculturative education—socio-cultural process that it is. They will have achieved the ability to approach the teaching-learning process from an

anthropological point of view, and as a result, to consciously learn and invent effective cross-cultural teaching through practical "research and development" in everyday teaching practice.

To become cross-cultural teachers, individuals should first seek instruction in general anthropology as background and to establish a knowledge base for further specialized instruction in the anthropological concept of culture and its relevance to the formal educational process. This further instruction should include the cultural basis of human knowledge, anthropologically explicated cultural diversity, especially in our own society—the new field of "Culture Studies" is not appropriate here. Education in general and schooling in particular as socio-cultural processes, and ethnography as an effective approach to seeking cross-cultural insight and understanding, as well as intercultural communication, must also be considered. All this education in pedagogical anthropology should be undertaken with the expressed purpose of developing, maintaining, expanding and refining an anthropological point of view applicable to public school teaching.

It is not necessary, nor should it be required that teachers be explicitly trained as anthropologists. Quality general education in the specific areas of anthropology noted above should be adequate. In conjunction with my failed attempt to develop an ongoing "Their Schools and Ours Cross-cultural Ethnographic Experience" project for undergraduates, I experimented with taking general education and education and anthropology co-major students into the field in Belize for brief comparative ethnographic learning experiences in village schools as the culminating learning activity of a larger program of anthropological instruction, including practical exercises involving ethnographic observation and interview in New York City public schools. This program, equivalent to an eighteen credit minor in anthropology at the

undergraduate level—a minor in "Practical Ethnography"—could easily be adapted for teacher education/re-education consistent with the preparation of educators for cross-cultural teaching.

* Cross-cultural Teachers must acquire as much direct information as possible about the specific cultures of orientation represented in the students they are charged with teaching.

The key word here is direct. Reading ethnographies assumed to be appropriate or applicable is not good enough. This cross-cultural learning must be undertaken utilizing the ethnographic approach, primarily employing the informant interview technique. The home of each student must be visited. The parent(s) or guardian need to be interviewed along with the student. An ethnographic report focusing on information relevant to directing the learning of that student should be completed and filed with the school. For a variety of reasons this should not be undertaken by individual teachers, but rather at a minimum by pairs of teachers that should be matched with each other based upon their diversity, rather than their cultural or ethnic similarity.

Further, in like manner, it is valuable to match teachers and families based on diversity, rather than on perceived cultural background similarity, with the possible exception of non-English speakers. Utilizing volunteer translators from the community is a technique that can be employed to preserve diversity in this language incompatibility situation. The need for both teachers and student family to "struggle together," in cross-cultural, face-to-face interaction, attempting to communicate with and to understand each other, represents a positive two-way learning experience (actually three-way with the student involved) that should be encouraged whenever possible, rather than avoided. This is the "heart" of the ethnographic learning experience. If there is an apparent or suspected cultural or ethnic similarity between teacher and student family, and it cannot be avoided, it is extremely important that the ethnographic

interview be approached by that teacher from the anthropological, cross-cultural perspective, avoiding the natural tendency to assume knowledge of cultural orientation that, for accuracy, must be obtained from or verified by the informant(s) themselves. Protocols for these ethnographic interviews and reports need to be developed through practice. I have, in preliminary form, a "Cultural Diversity Survey" questionnaire already developed that can be used as a starting point for these ethnographic interviews.

Efforts should also be made by teachers to practice participant observation in the communities from which their students are drawn. Participation in these cross-cultural "outings" by the teacher's family where appropriate, is certainly acceptable and encouraged. Increased cross-cultural communication in the neighborhoods and communities of their students can help teachers succeed in the classroom, permitting, in some cases, the marshaling of community resources in support of the teaching-learning process both inside and outside the school. Ultimately, the teacher must learn to function as if the total professional experience—inside the classroom, inside the school, inside the student's home, inside the student's community—were an ongoing ethnographic "field" experience, because, for a successful cross-cultural teacher, that is precisely what it must be.

* Cross-cultural Teachers must reach a consensus with both the individual student (to the extent the student's age permits this) and the student's parent(s) or guardian concerning the specific educational goals (in the form of a written Student-oriented Educational Plan) toward which the student will be working at the school.

Obviously, these goals must be compatible with both the student's and the school's realistic capabilities. And they must, of course, reflect the learning requirements of the school. They need to be immediate, but may also be seen as long term by extending them from the

present into the future. These goals should be revisited annually. Negotiating these goals is an extremely important and critical task for teachers. It is these mutually agreed upon educational goals, rather than "school requirements" that should be invoked in subsequent discussions with both the student and the student's family. The process probably should not be undertaken as part of the initial home ethnographic interview, although information intended to address this task should certainly be obtained at that time. Both the ethnographic team (the teachers) and the family (at a minimum the student and guardian) should have time to "digest" the initial interview experience before addressing this critical issue.

One of the interview team should indicate in that first encounter, however, that a draft "Student-oriented Educational Plan" for the student will be prepared following the initial interview. It should be further noted that a second "get together" will be required to "go over" and to "agree upon" that draft plan, which will always be open to "mutual reconsideration.". Formal education is an extensive journey that must not be undertaken by either teacher or student, including the student's parent(s) or guardian, unless and until they both have some mutual understanding of where they hope to be going together. And there is, of course, plenty of room for adding side trips, detours and even modified destinations along the way.

It would be helpful if the student's family could be given the choice of having the second "get together" at home or in the school, preferably in the classroom, where the student is expected to be assigned. Ideally one of the initial interview team should be the teacher from that classroom. There is nothing really wrong with the interview team "encouraging" the family to "come visit the school" for this second meeting. But this should only go as far as indicating that it would be a "good idea" and that the family is surely "welcome." If the family gives any indication that they would be more comfortable having this important second meeting in their

own home, the interview team should immediately support the family's choice. Some parents or guardians, especially the "undereducated," are very intimidated by schools. Teachers, if not the school, must be seen as willing to accommodate, as much as possible, family and student wishes and needs. This is the opposite of the current position of many ethnocentric teachers and administrators who frequently expect everyone to accommodate the wishes of "the school."

The "not too formal sounding" education plan that results from the second meeting with the student's family should become a matter of record in the student's personal educational file at the school. A copy should also be given to the family in the appropriate language with a bilingual English translation when the household language in not English. Further, depending on the age of the student, a copy should go to the student as well. Teachers must never forget in the generation of this mutually acceptable Student-oriented Educational Plan that the needs of all four "parties" involved in the formal education process must be considered: 1–the student, 2–the student's family, 3–the teacher and 4–the school. And in the public education process, some would add a fifth party: 5–the larger society.

Regardless of how the authorities who run the school see it, teachers, especially cross-cultural teachers, are more than simply employees of the school or even the larger authority responsible for running the school. They are professional educators—although as ethnocentric teachers, they have been increasingly deprived of their ability to function this way, and they also seem to be increasingly willing to forfeit their responsibility and desire to actually "be" this way. As the professional educators that they are, however, public school cross-cultural teachers do have rather profound responsibilities to all the parties involved in the public education process. Recognizing and attempting to meet all those, at times conflicting, responsibilities is what makes them professional educators and not just ethnocentric teachers and "employees" of a culture

transmitting or reproducing "factory." Fortunately, the teachers at a school are all in the schooling process together and can and should help and support each other in all their professional endeavors. This requires more of a sodality (read "association" here) of professional educators and less of a "teachers' union."

For cross-cultural teachers, however, their ultimate allegiance and responsibility will have be to their individual students and the students' families with whom they are involved. This is because, in the final analysis, they are the only individuals uniquely prepared and positioned to advocate for what these intended recipients—and I might point out again, also required recipients—of the public school experience are supposed to receive: the best education possible under the circumstances. I know; I know! Not enough pay; too much responsibility. So what else is new?

* Cross-cultural Teachers must pay greater attention to the development and communication of rationales for the acquisition of specific learning-outcomes, tailoring them to individual students based upon knowledge of the culture of orientation the student brings to the teaching-learning process and the specific Student-oriented Education Plan produced for that student.

It is difficult to achieve communication across cultural borders. Successfully directing learning across those borders is even more difficult, because more than communication is required. The active participation of the student in the teaching-learning process, as well as the willing acceptance of the teacher as the director of that process, is essential. Teachers must use everything that they know and can learned about individual students, including and especially the student's cultural background, goals and aspirations, to achieve this willing participation in the educational experience.

Rationales for learning need to be realistic and concrete, as well as culturally sensitive and aware. Teachers operating from an anthropological point of view have a better chance of generating and communicating effectively the different kinds of rationales that teaching and learning in a culturally diverse situation require. Students must be motivated to learn or learning will not occur. The teacher must effectively answer the student question, "Why do I need to learn this?" And the best answers to this question can differ form student to student. Cross-cultural awareness and sensitivity are absolutely essential here.

* Cross-cultural Teachers must cease being authorities for educational content.

Teachers must not allow themselves to be seen as purveyors of the "truth." One culture's "truth" can be another culture's "lie." The function of the teacher is to direct students to content resources or prepared materials, for example: texts, other books, films, audio tapes, video tapes, CDs, DVDs, curriculum guides, fact sheets, newspapers, journal and magazine articles, (I guess I have to say the Internet here also), and other instructional media. The teacher should not be the medium for content.

Students should not be encouraged to become purveyors of "truth" either. They should be encouraged to be aware of differences of opinion or position on critical issues and be able to attribute specific opinions or positions to specific sources or authorities (the Internet, even a specific web page, unless verifiable, is not a reliable source—unfortunately too much of the internet is a technologically sophisticated version of public restroom walls).

Teachers should avoid giving their own position (read "opinion" here). When called upon to give an opinion, there is nothing wrong with a teacher saying, "What I think isn't really important here," or "I'm not really sure," or even "As everybody's teacher, I probably shouldn't give a specific opinion on such a controversial issue." When it is necessary for the teacher to be

the source of content, teachers should attribute the specific position or content they provide to an authority, even utilizing the school itself as the authority of last resort. In this situation students should be informed that the presented material represents the expected answer on a test "in school," even though not everyone might agree with that answer outside the school. We all can and do learn different cultural behavior appropriate for different cultural situations.

Teachers should be careful about the use of the word, "fact." One culture's "facts" are frequently countered by another culture's "facts." And you cannot disprove "facts' cross-culturally; they just metamorphose into "beliefs" that can almost never be unwillingly disproved. Remember that cultures see and understand reality differently. Teachers must avoid being forced to take sides themselves. Rather they can, as just suggested above, interpret the "school's" position for "testing purposes," but it is all right to acknowledge that the school's current position may not be the "final word on the issue." When you have been around an "anthropological point of view" for as long as some anthropologists have, you realize that there really are no "final words," anyway.

Your job as a cross-culture teacher is to help students learn how to negotiate a polycultural society and polycultural world filled with conflicting "truths," as well as learn what answers will be expected in the school's version of that world. All this does not have to end up challenging the student's identity, nor destroying the teacher's capacity to successfully direct learning in the teaching-learning process. It does, however, require ongoing cross-cultural negotiation from an anthropological point of view. Teachers must be prepared to learn and willing to acknowledge that learning. You have got to talk to your students, all of your students, and listen and try to understand when they talk back to you. Authorities, one of which you must

not become, already "know" what's important to know about most things, including their students, at least they think they do. Learn to say, "I don't know," when it's appropriate.

* Cross-cultural Teachers must work to be perceived as being culturally neutral and cross-culturally interested, concerned and genuinely willing to learn first-hand about others.

Teachers need to permit their students to teach them and even the rest of the class about the different cultures of orientation represented in the classroom. I once observed a teacher in the name of "multiculturalism" present a very good lesson on "her people" and certain aspects of their religion. Unfortunately, she expressed no interest whatsoever in any of the other groups and their religions represented in her classroom. I know this, because I also interviewed her about her "approach to multicultural education." This woman became "the Other" to many of her students—if she was not already—and she was obviously very proud of being recognized as that "Other." She genuinely felt that everybody should know her cultural "different ness," but genuinely had no interest in theirs. Her primary concern was to help "her people" not be "misunderstood."

As a teacher, the classroom is not the place to be an advocate for your particular culture of orientation, even in the name of "multicultural" education. Cultural diversity needs to be exchanged, but keep who you are culturally to a minimum and do not "go native" in an effort to be "multicultural." Always remember; it is cultural diversity, not "multiculturalism," even when cultural knowledge is being successfully exchanged or apparently shared. The teacher's role is cross-cultural moderator. Cultural neutrality is your goal. And teachers must never act as if they are authorities on someone else's culture, especially when that "someone else" is in the room. In fact, the rule should be that when it comes to culture, either the teacher's or the Other's, the teacher should never be seen as the cultural authority. Let others tell both their own and your

own story. You can be a cross-cultural teacher and retain your own cultural identity, just be "neutral" when you are on duty as a teacher. That is part of what professionalism is all about.

Recognition of the more or less publicly available aspects of another's culture is good, however. There is a difference between being seen as a cultural "authority" or "expert," and being seen as cross-culturally aware. One day in class long before 9/11, I happened to mention that Ramadan had just started. After class two Moslem students thanked me for publicly recognizing their existence. They said it had never happened before. We talked, and I learned more about Ramadan in particular, and Islam in general that day than I had ever known. To this day I continue to be recognized and greeted on campus when I pass Moslem students. They know me, but my original two contacts in the Moslem community graduated a long time ago.

• Cross-cultural Teachers must learn, for the purpose of developing individualized, culturally appropriate, learning activities, to separate the skills they are teaching from the content that is being used to teach those skills.

Public education appears to be concerned with the development and refinement of the following basis skills: speaking, reading, writing, calculating and thinking. Thinking should include reasoning, which is sometimes referred to as "critical thinking" and/or "problem solving," and creative thinking, which unfortunately is not given much formal attention in school, except under very controlled circumstances, and does not even seem to be universally thought of as "thinking" in the first place (read "creativity" here). Skills can be more cross-cultural than content. Let me say that again. Skills can be more cross-cultural than content. The context within which skills are learned and eventually utilized is or tends to be more culture-specific than the skills themselves.

When skills are embedded in specific content for teaching purposes they tend to take on the cultural "flavor" of that content. Initially every effort should be made to provide students with the opportunity to learn and practice new skills in a context—that is to say, utilizing content—that is more, rather than less, compatible with their individual cultures of orientation. The student's family and community can be tapped as resources here, but it takes cross-cultural teachers—teachers capable of approaching the development of learning activities, as well as their implementation, from an anthropological point of view—to really make all this work in the teaching-learning process for their culturally diverse students.

Outside funding was used some years ago in the southern-most Toledo district of Belize to develop culture-specific materials to help K'ekchi' speaking Mayan children develop English language skills. As a "culturally diverse" former British colony, the language of instruction, as well as the language instructed, in the schools in Belize is English. Unfortunately, there was no money to help non-K'ekchi' speaking ethnocentric teachers assigned to K'ekchi' village schools become more cross-cultural, or even bilingual, with respect to the implementation and utilization of these really very good materials. The result, as far as I can tell as an admittedly limited ethnographic visitor and observer, was that the whole project had very little actual opportunity to impact on the ability of these Mayan children to acquire the "lingua franca" of their larger country. Ethnocentric teachers failed to implement the materials effectively.

Teachers must first help all their students acquire basic skills embedded in content compatible with the individual cultures of orientation of those students. Then they can turn to the more difficult task of helping students use their newly acquired basic skills to address the content oriented learning-outcomes required by the more mainstream culture-specific educational objectives of the public school curriculum. To maximize the potential for success,

learning should move from the "more familiar" to the "less familiar" in steps or stages. If the skill is "less familiar," at least the context and content with in which it is first learned and practiced should be "more familiar." As the skill becomes "more familiar," the new context and content that the skill is to be used to learn can be "less familiar."

* Whenever possible Cross-cultural Teachers should employ criterion referenced formative evaluation in the preparation of students for major summative exams and standard tests.

Teaching in a culturally diverse situation requires that individual student competition for success (read "grades" here) be minimized and preferably eliminated. Criterion referenced evaluation can be used to encourage cooperation among students working to achieve the same learning-outcomes. Students who require the least amount of time to achieve the specified criterion level can be encouraged to assist, on a one-to-one basis, students who require more time to achieve the same criterion level. Getting everyone to reach the specified criterion level becomes a group effort in which teacher and students work cooperatively together.

This approach is particularly valuable vis-à-vis complex learning-outcomes, especially where some degree of specific analysis of individual "failure" by a "peer tutor," involving immediate and direct feedback, can shorten the time required by the learner to achieve criterion level performance. This situation also capitalizes on what has been called the "personal-social aspect of learning." Humans are social animals. As long as they are comfortable with the social situation, students respond better when learning involves social interaction, especially with a peer, but also with a trusted and supportive teacher.

I saw this firsthand in a multi-track delivery system for teaching introductory anthropology that I designed and implemented in conjunction with my Doctoral program. In the individualized instruction track, we utilized a Mastery Learning strategy with a modification of

the original Personalized System of Instruction developed by Fred Keller and known in individualized instruction circles as the "Keller Plan." Course content was broken down into self-instruction units, and students were required to take a Mastery Tests at the end of each unit. If mastery was not initially demonstrated, students were required to have a tutoring appointment with a peer tutor and to take a Retest. We called these peer tutors, who were top-performing students recruited from the previous semester's enrollment, "Learning Aides." When students, who had originally performed poorly on the Mastery Test, came back and "maxed" the retest and were asked about the turn-around in their performance, they invariably mentioned their Learning Aide. Frequently they indicated something to the effect that they didn't want to let down their Learning Aide who so obviously wanted them to succeed. That single course went on, by the way, to eventually serve some 2000 students a year in the statewide university system with tutoring appointments conducted over telephone lines (yes, it worked just fine) for students taking the course on Commonwealth campuses. When I completed my Doctorate and left the university, what had been a highly successful method of teaching introductory anthropology quietly went away, because none of the research oriented faculty in the department wanted to work as hard as I had "teaching" (read "directing" here) such a complex program of instruction.

The specific skills for managing a classroom to capitalize on the advantages of "socially interactive learning" must be developed by teachers in practice, but cross-cultural teachers who approach the teaching-learning process from an anthropological point of view are already one step in that direction, because of the way they perceive and value individual students as members of, and participants in, the larger diverse class and school community.

* Cross-cultural Teachers concerned with successfully directing the teaching-learning process for all their culturally diverse students must learn how to approach that process utilizing the

"Systems Model of Instruction" while employing the "Principles of (Effective) Instruction with which the model was developed to be compatible.

The Systems Approach to Instruction is a problem-solving model for the teaching-learning process that can be used to improve instruction by permitting original instructional design, as well as modifications to that original design, to accommodate cultural and other learning differences in individual students. Cross-cultural teaching, while not eliminating the group approach to instruction characteristic of the ethnocentric (culture-specific) teaching traditionally associated with enculturative education, does require the maximization of individualizing techniques to also achieve greater acculturative education in situations of cultural diversity. Approaching instruction utilizing the Systems Model makes it possible to accommodate both of these socio-cultural processes, enculturative as well as acculturative education, in those public schools where only group-based enculturative education is now attempted.

The Principles of (Effective) Instruction are practices that have been shown to increase the probability of achieving specific learning-outcomes in individual students. Cross-cultural teachers need to be aware of these principles and their application in both group and individualized approaches to instruction. The anthropological point of view is particularly compatible with both the Principles of (Effective) Instruction and the Systems Model of Instruction. Both require the analytical, problem solving approach to the teaching-learning process compatible with awareness of the anthropological concept of culture and the unique perspective this awareness provides public school teachers who do not now possess it.

*Finally, but probably primarily, learning outcomes that are less than compatible with the cultural orientation a student brings to the teaching-learning process must be offered by Cross-

cultural Teachers as alternative, situation-specific, adaptive knowledge and behavior. This must replace their presentation as universally proper and correct (yet culture-specific) knowledge and behavior that is characteristic of the Enculturative Model of Education currently utilized by ethnocentric teachers in our polycultural classrooms.

Clearly, this is the heart of the cross-cultural teaching process. Humans can acquire the knowledge and behavior necessary to succeed in different, even alien, cultural situations, if they do not see their cultural identity as challenged in the process. Fortunately, when I went onto active duty in the military during the Viet Nam era, I had a fair idea of who I was or at least who I was becoming. I had learned how to survive in what was for me the very alien environment of the military during my ROTC training. In fact, I was so successful at this that upon graduation I was offered a regular Army commission, rather than the reserve commission I chose to accept. I had fooled the Army into perceiving me as "lifer" material. This kind of "learning how to get over" can be the necessary first step in what eventually becomes an acculturation process for many individuals. Many students must be permitted to approach their public schooling as a process of learning how to "get over" in an alien culture. This is what many students, especially in urban centers, think they are doing in public education today anyway. Unfortunately, they discover too late, if they ever discover at all, that they have not really learned how to "get over" (read "be successful" here) in the larger society, but only in its public schools.

I deal with these students every day in my introductory anthropology sections at the city college where I teach. Many managed to get acceptable, even good, grades in high school. But when they are expected to assume a greater responsibility for teaching themselves, as they are in higher education, they have not the slightest idea what to do. Many waste valuable time and effort attempting to "get over, " rather than doing what they need to be doing to learn. They

keep waiting for me to tell them specifically what to learn and what to do to learn it. When I assign a book for them to read, many do not read it. They wait for me to tell them what is important for them to know from the book. When I tell them that what is in the book is not nearly as important as their ability to analyze its content in terms of what we are doing in the course—that in higher education learning how to think relatively is more important than learning what to think absolutely—they look at me as if I am crazy. Some catch on to "college level learning" (read "self-instruction" here) by the end of the course, but many don't. Public school teachers attempt to direct learning in pupils. College teachers profess disciplined knowledge through what are essentially programs of student-oriented self-instruction. That is why they are called professors and not teachers

By looking at the teaching-learning process from the anthropological point of view, cross-cultural teachers can see where students need to be given the permission and opportunity to learn as adaptive behavior in specific cultural situations, rather than to learn as a process of changing to become more acceptable to the mainstream culture of our society and the school as its enculturative representative. On the personal level, actual culture change (acculturation) for many individuals comes after and lags well behind the acquisition of the knowledge upon which that change depends, if it ever comes at all. And in a free society, that change is a matter of individual choice. The task of culture-adaptive education through cross-cultural teaching is to achieve the knowledge base and understanding in individual students upon which that choice can eventually be made, even if that knowledge and understanding are only used, in the final analysis, to consciously choose just to continue "getting over" and not to "become" something culturally different. Because of ethnocentric teaching, that essential knowledge base and cross-cultural understanding are not being achieved in many students in our public schools today.

The ten First Principles of Cross-cultural Teaching just presented are by no means all that needs to or can be said about this new approach to teaching in our public schools based upon the achievement of an anthropological point of view and its application to directing the teaching-learning process in both enculturative and acculturative education. But they should be sufficient to give a clear indication of how cross-cultural teaching will differ from ethnocentric (culture-specific) teaching in actual practice. Obviously cross-cultural teaching involves a lot more work than the ethnocentric teaching that is now characteristic of enculturative education in our public schools.

That is clearly one of the primary reasons why cross-cultural teaching needs to be invented, and has not at this point come into existence on its own, although all or most of the ingredients are already out there. Humans, unless consciously aware and motivated, seldom work harder than they can get away with working. But once awareness of a "better way" becomes known, humans frequently end up working harder than they did before to secure the benefits that are now both known and actually available, while they were only potentially available, but unknown, before. Real "practical knowledge" that "works in the real world" will "get you every time." That is why students who can be shown that they can learn what schools are attempting to teach them without their having to personally sacrifice their cultural identity, frequently respond where they did not—dare I say "refused" to—respond before. Cross-cultural teaching is not a "magic bullet" nor is it a panacea for all our educational problems. It is an approach to the teaching-learning process from which public school teachers can begin learning and working together professionally to achieve that most elusive prize of all, a re-form of public education compatible with our imperfect polycultural society that offers the best possibility of a

positive public learning experience for all our children, regardless of the cultures of orientation they bring with them to our culturally mainstream public schools.

The steps in the process of becoming a cross-cultural teacher for the individual educator are obvious: 1. – Get the necessary education in the anthropological concept of culture, an anthropological point of view, and ethnographic methods and techniques required. 2. – Begin to experiment with and invent cross-cultural teaching in your work as a public school teacher. 3. – Join with other cross-cultural teachers to learn, to exchange knowledge and information, and to mutually support each other, first in your own school, then in other schools. 4. – Organize as cross-cultural teachers and become the force for "educational success" that professional public educators should be. Beyond that the sky seems to be the limit: possible federal and/or state funding for independent regional Cross-cultural Teacher-education Institutes and scholarships for teacher re-education; recognition of cross-cultural teaching as a professional specialization worthy of salaries at least one-third higher than present ethnocentric (culture-specific) teachers (this will require a longer work-year, however); creation of a position in polycultural schools for a "Pedagogical Anthropologist" to organize and coordinate the professional activities of cross-cultural teachers; the organization and staffing of elementary schools to serve as "Community Educational and Human Development (to include public and mental health) Centers" for adults as well as children. I had better stop here, but it truly is both exciting and inspiring to dream about the possibilities. Teaching and dreaming have got to be part of the same process. It is teachers who help us to envision a better tomorrow, and then help us become worthy and capable of realizing that future—that dream made real through successful public education.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

SO 034368

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Culture, Freedom and Pedagogy in the Public School Classroom: Learning to Teach from an Anthropological Point of View or Pedagogical Anthropology and the Reform of Public Education	
Author(s): D. Michael Steffy	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature:

Printed Name/Position/Title: D. MICHAEL STEFFY FOR POSITION/TITLE SEE FIRST PAGE OF PAPER

Organization/Address: QUEENS COLLEGE ANTHROPOLOGY 65-30 KISSENA BLVD. FLUSHING, NY 11367

Telephone: 718 997-5512 FAX: 718 997 2885

E-Mail Address: DMSTEFFY@QC.EDU Date: 11/18/02

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC/CHESS
2805 E. Tenth Street, #120
Bloomington, IN 47408

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: info@ericfac.piccard.csc.com
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)